

III. REMARKS

1. Claims 1, 13, 14 and 22 are amended. Claim 17 is amended to correct the antecedent basis error. Claims 32 and 33 are new.

2. Claims 1-2, 8, 10-14, 16, 18-22 and 27-31 are not anticipated by Bellamy under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Bellamy does not disclose or suggest a portable coupling device for attaching a mobile phone to a television device so as to extend the user interface of the mobile phone to the television device. At most, Bellamy uses a personal computer coupled to a set-top box of a television to provide an interface and allow for certain interaction between the television, set top box and the personal computer. The telephone 2 in Bellamy interfaces with and interacts with the personal computer 10. The personal computer in Bellamy is necessarily coupled to the Enhanced Set Top Box 5, which in turn is coupled to, and interacts with, the television 1. The telephone 2 in Bellamy is shown as being coupled to the Video & Telephone Interface Card 9 of the Personal Computer 10. The Video and Telephone Interface Card 9 of Bellamy is then coupled to the Enhanced Set Top Box 5. Thus, Bellamy requires a series of interfaces and coupling mechanisms to enable any integration of the telephone services with a video display, such as the television 1. (See e.g. FIG. 1, and Abstract, lines 1-11). Applicant's invention does not define such a scheme with a personal computer interacting with a set top box for interfacing with the television, as shown for example in FIG. 1.

In Bellamy, the telephone 2 can be coupled to the computer 10, which is coupled to the enhanced set-top box 5, which is in turn coupled to the TV 1. This is not Applicant's invention. Applicant's invention is a coupling device that couples a mobile

phone to a television device and extends the user interface of the telephone to the television device. In Applicant's invention, the coupling device receives a second information signal from the mobile phone, converts the second information signal to a third information signal, and supplies the third information signal to an input of the television device. This is not disclosed or suggested by Bellamy, because in Bellamy the telephone interfaces with the personal computer, which interfaces with the enhanced set top box, which interfaces with the TV. (See e.g. FIG. 1).

The "coupling device" of Applicant's invention is not met by the enhanced set-top box of Bellamy as alleged by the Examiner. In Bellamy the enhanced set top box 5 is necessary to provide an interface between the personal computer 10 and the television device 1. The telephone 2 is coupled to and interacts with the personal computer 10. In Applicant's invention, the coupling device receives a second information signal in a second format from the mobile phone which is converted to a third information signal, which is supplied, via the first output, to the first input of the television device. This is clearly not shown or evident from Bellamy.

In Bellamy, it is the PC 10 that is coupled to the telephone and telephone lines. (See FIG. 1). The telephone 2 feeds to the Video & Telephone Interface Card 9, which in turn provides signals to and from the Enhanced Set Top Box 5, which is coupled to the TV 1. Applicant's invention does not show such a process. In Applicant's invention, the coupling device includes a converter that converts the second information to a third information signal that is supplied to the television device. In Bellamy, the VTIC 9 in the PC 10 detects the ringing status and

information. (Col. 6, lines 51-52). The VTIC 9 generates a pop-up window. (Col. 6, lines 64-66). The pop-up window is transferred to ESTB 5 where it is inserted into the video image. Thus, the set-top box of Bellamy does not perform the claimed functions, and does not have the claimed features, of Applicant's invention.

Bellamy integrates Internet services and telephone services with a video display, such as a TV set. (Col. 2, lines 18-20). The invention of Bellamy requires a personal computer 10 for "system intelligence" with a connection from a "set-top box." (Col. 2, lines 21-25). The personal computer "processes" the "requests" and generates "pop-up windows" that are sent back to the "set-top box" for "insertion" into the video image. (Col. 2, lines 25-29). This is not the same as Applicant's invention.

Also, Applicant's invention is directed to a "portable coupling device" to attach a mobile phone to a television device. There is nothing "portable" about Bellamy. Bellamy's invention requires an "enhanced set-top box (ESTB 5)" that can forward commands to a "video and telephone interface card (VTIC) 9 in PC 10 utilizing data link 7." (Col. 3, lines 18-26). Thus, Bellamy requires at least two separate devices to provide the necessary interfaces to generate its pop-up window, (Col. 3, lines 17-41), and is silent as to the issue of portability.

Bellamy also requires a separate telephone line connection 14 to the personal computer. (Col. 3, lines 49-50). Bellamy additionally requires a data link 7 between ESTB 5 and VTIC 9. (Col. 5, lines 7-11).

In Bellamy, the VTIC 9 detects a ringing status and caller ID information of an incoming call. (Col. 6, lines 51-54). The

VTIC 9 generates a pop-up window containing the calling number information and a set of user configurable options for handling the call. (Col. 6, lines 64-66).

Thus, it is evident that the invention of Bellamy requires at least the enhanced set-top box and the PC 10 to provide the interface between the telephone 12 and the TV 1. (See Col. 8, lines 44-52). In fact, Bellamy requires another "separate" box dedicated to enhanced services. (Col. 9, lines 1-5). This is not the same as Applicant's invention, since Applicant's invention does not use a set-top box and does not require a PC.

Also, Applicant's invention "extends" the "user interface" of the mobile phone to the television device. Bellamy is silent on such a feature. Presenting a caller-ID and a menu pre-configured options are not the same as extending the user interface of the mobile device to the display of the television device.

Thus, claims 1, 13, 14, 22 and 29 are not anticipated by Bellamy. Claims 2, 8, 10-12, 16, 18-21, 27, 30 and 31 should be allowable by reason of their respective dependencies.

3. Claims 4, 6, 15, 17, 23-24 and 26 are not unpatentable over Bellamy under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). These claims should be allowable at least in view of their respective dependencies.

With regard to claim 4, the claim recites that the first output is an antenna cable connector. The first output supplies the third information signal to the television device. Thus, the Examiner's Official Notice is misplaced and respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim 6, the claim recites an "internal power source." The Examiner's Official Notice is directed to providing

power to a set-top box, but not an "internal" power source. Thus, this rejection is respectfully traversed and proof is requested.

Claim 16 recites that the coupling device includes a battery charger to charge the portable external device. The Examiner's Official Notice is traversed and the Examiner is requested to provide evidence that a set-top box would include a battery charger for an "external device as claimed by Applicant. Applicant submits that such a configuration is not disclosed or suggested by the art of record and claim 16 is allowable.

Claim 17 recites that the coupling device includes means to turn off circuitry providing unnecessary functions to save power. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's Official Notice and requests evidentiary proof that such features would be included in the set-top box of Bellamy. A "power switch" device mentioned by the Examiner is not the same as the features recited in the claim.

Claim 23 recites "replacing" an image. Bellamy only recites adding a pop-up window. Thus, this feature of Applicant's invention is neither disclosed nor suggested. The image displayed on Bellamy's TV is not an image of the display of the mobile phone, but rather a pop-up window is generated by the VTIC 9 and sent to the ESTB 5. This is quite unlike Applicant's invention.

4. Claim 7 is not unpatentable over Bellamy in view of Allport under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 7 should be allowable at least by reason of its dependency and prior arguments.


5. Claims 3, 5 and 25 are not unpatentable over Bellamy in view of Bodle under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). These claims should also be allowable by reason of their respective dependencies, and prior

arguments. Furthermore, Bodle is unrelated to mobile phones. Thus, it is non-analogous art and there is no motivation to combine Bellamy with Bodle to achieve Applicants' invention.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

A check for \$110 is enclosed for a on-month extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,


Geza C. Ziegler, Jr.
Reg. No. 44,004

26 October 2004
Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800 Ext. 134
Customer No.: 2512

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP AMENDMENT, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 26 October 2004

Signature: Muhammad Baye
Person Making Deposit